

### **Media Contact:**

Will Wiquist will.wiquist@fcc.gov

For Immediate Release

# FCC PLANS TO REMOVE COMPANIES FROM KEY DATABASE FOR NON-COMPLIANCE WITH ANTI-ROBOCALL RULES

Companies Removed from Robocall Mitigation Database Can No Longer Hand Off
Call Traffic to Other Networks

WASHINGTON, October 3, 2022—The FCC's Robocall Response Team today announced first-of-their-kind Enforcement Bureau <u>orders</u> to begin removing seven voice service providers from the agency's Robocall Mitigation Database. Providers must take key robocall mitigation steps – including implementing STIR/SHAKEN throughout their IP networks – and if they fail to demonstrate that they have met these requirements, they can be removed from the database and other networks will no longer take their traffic.

#### FCC Chairwoman Jessica Rosenworcel:

"This is a new era. If a provider doesn't meet its obligations under the law, it now faces expulsion from America's phone networks. Fines alone aren't enough. Providers that don't follow our rules and make it easy to scam consumers will now face swift consequences."

#### What's New:

Today's Enforcement Bureau orders demanded that Akabis, Cloud4, Global UC, Horizon Technology Group, Morse Communications, Sharon Telephone Company, and SW Arkansas Telecommunications and Technology show cause within 14 days as to why the FCC should not remove them from the database. Removal from the database would require all intermediate providers and terminating voice service providers to cease carrying the companies' traffic. If that were to occur, all calls from these providers' customers would be blocked and no traffic originated by the provider would reach the called party.

"These and other recent actions reflect the seriousness with which we take providers' obligations to take concrete and impactful steps to combat robocalls," said Loyaan A. Egal, acting Chief of the Enforcement Bureau. "STIR/SHAKEN is not optional. And if your network isn't IP-based so you cannot yet use these standards, we need to see the steps taken to mitigate illegal robocalls. These providers have fallen woefully short and have now put at risk their continued participation in the U.S. communications system. While we'll review their responses, we will not accept superficial gestures given the gravity of what is at stake."

# **How We Got Here:**

The FCC launched the Robocall Mitigation Database in which voice service providers must file certifications to inform the agency of their <u>STIR/SHAKEN</u> implementation status and, in some cases, their robocall mitigation efforts. Voice service providers certifying to anything short of full STIR/SHAKEN implementation must describe the robocall mitigation steps they are taking to ensure they are not the source of illegal robocalls. If a voice service provider does

not file or does not adequately file in the database, other voice service providers must block the noncompliant provider's calls.

## The Bigger Picture:

Under Chairwoman Rosenworcel, the Robocall Response Team was created to serve as an FCC staff working group that pulls together expertise from across the agency to leverage the talents of enforcers, attorneys, policy makers, engineers, economists, and outreach experts to combat the unyielding menace of illegal spoofed, scam, robocalls.

# This effort has resulted in:

- record-breaking spoofing and robocall fines;
- closing gateways used by international robocallers to reach Americans' phones;
- widespread implementation of STIR/SHAKEN caller ID authentication standards to help traceback illegal calls and improve blocking tools to protect consumers;
- the signing of robocall investigation partnerships with <u>43 states</u> plus the District of Columbia and Guam; and
- unprecedented policy proposals to combat the rising threat of bogus robotexts.

###

Media Relations: (202) 418-0500 / ASL: (844) 432-2275 / Twitter: @FCC / www.fcc.gov

This is an unofficial announcement of Commission action. Release of the full text of a Commission order constitutes official action. See MCI v. FCC, 515 F.2d 385 (D.C. Cir. 1974).